

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-103 remain in this application.

In the Office action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-103 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The Examiner has identified specific language to be brought into compliance with Office practice. Applicants submit that as-amended, the claims comply with Office practice.

Further, the Examiner has indicated that the term "polycyanates" is confusing. Applicants submit that the term is defined in the specification and thus, the meaning would be clear to one having ordinary skill in the art. See page 4, lines 23-29 of the specification.

Moreover, the Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 1-103 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-18, 21-52, 55-84 and 87-119 of copending application No. 09/695,332. A terminal disclaimer is concurrently filed with the Amendment to overcome this provisional rejection.

Applicants submit that claims 1-103 of this patent case are in condition for allowance, and thus request reconsideration of the claims.

Very truly yours,



Carol A. Marmo  
Registration No. 39,761  
Attorney for Applicant

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania  
September 8, 2003